

A SENSITIVITY SESSION

ALL-HANDS MEETING

D. I. Lowenstein
May 5, 2006

TOPICS

■ Cu theft and path forward

- C-AD is not alone with this problem. LIPA / Plant Engineering just “lost” 1500 lbs. of aluminum

■ Line accountability

- Staff input
- Department policy

Copper Theft From Building 912

Time Line for Missing Prototype Coils

- 1987: prototype coils purchased for \$20,000
- 2001: prototype coils stored in Building 209
- June 2005: prototype coils moved to Building 912
 - Roof leaks in Building 209 threaten to damage coils
- August 2005: wooden crate damage inspected
- February 23, 2006: crate repairs to begin
- February 28, 2006: search for coils is fruitless
- March 3, 2006: Safeguards and Security notified

Box containing the 4 coils that were stolen



Factors Contributing to Theft

- Latent management weaknesses:
 - Lack of awareness and/or complacency by C-AD personnel
 - No provision in procedures to transfer responsibility
 - No specified line accountability for theft
 - Roof leaks initiated a flawed security process

Action: Increase Worker Involvement

- Require Building Managers do weekly walk-downs
- Add security inspections to the C-AD Tier 1
- Require an annual "Read and Acknowledge"
- Security to be discussed at every meeting
- Security to be part of work planning
- All hands meeting to discuss the incident

Action: Increase Line Accountability

- Transfer accountability when owner leaves
- Management chain accountability for security requirements
- Specify standards for disciplinary action

Action: Increase Management Commitment

- Provide resources to reduce inventories
- Provide resources to keep storage areas in shape
- Review Building 912 to set up a secure area
- Review security issues at annual Management Review

Other Corrective Actions

- Review the present inventory database:
 - Ensure each item in the database assigned to person
 - Require database entry if items are stored or removed
- Video surveillance or the equivalent in storage areas
- Ensure Group procedures match Department procedures

Summary of Security Meetings

- Most locations: no camera surveillance or card readers. Adding surveillance.
- We are consolidating and reducing our inventory in B912. In progress.
- We will have a professional look at the details. Done.
- We will reduce the total inventory. In progress
- We will increase training and emphasis on accountability. In progress.

Things We Recognize

- Recognition of a lapse in judgment and failure to follow procedure
- A magnet takes more than a forklift and significant time to disassemble
 - But not impossible, what risk should be taken by management?
- There is lots of buss work on the walls of 912
 - What risk should be taken by management?
- Photo quality is typically very poor; often hard to recognize a face
 - Is there better equipment?
- Everyone is instructed to lock their offices at the end of the workday
 - We follow up with individual when security sends report that a door was open

DOE Security Review Team Recommendations

- Consolidate in central storage areas
- Enhance security in those areas
- Inventory those items
- Mark those items
- Lock those storage areas
- Use a key control system for building and heavy equipment
- Train C-AD staff in security awareness
- Maintain fencing and lighting for outside storage areas
- Post security areas with warning signs
- Assign R2A2s for security
- Establish a C-AD security working group

Line Accountability

-
- Beliefs and perceptions
 - Accountability
 - Feedback from proposal
 - Final draft result

Line Accountability Improvement Based on Survey Question (January 2006)

To what extent can injuries be prevented? Check the answer that represents your personal belief.

- ☐ All can be prevented.
- ☐ Almost all can be prevented.
- ☐ Many can be prevented.
- ☐ Some can be prevented.
- ☐ Few can be prevented.

Results From C-AD Staff

- “The belief by supervisors and workers that not all injuries can be prevented is an indicator that line managers and supervisors are not being held fully and fairly accountable. Ignoring this “soft factor” may hold C-AD back from achieving a sustained level of excellence.”

TABLE 3 All Injuries Are Preventable

Responding Group	% Who Believed That All Injuries Can Be Prevented In 2004	% Who Believe That All Injuries Can Be Prevented In 2006	Best Safe Companies, Mean	Worst Safe Companies, Mean
Managers	47	65	67	25
Supervisors	7	19	73	23
Workers	9	22	46	15
All	14	25	57	20

Results From Lab Wide Surveys, 2006

TABLE 3 All Injuries Are Preventable

Responding Group	% Who Believe That All Injuries Can Be Prevented	Best Safe Companies, Mean	Worst Safe Companies, Mean
Managers	32	67	25
Supervisors	6	73	23
Workers	13	46	15
All	16	57	20

Feedback on Draft Standard for Disciplinary Action

- In the case of all items for which there may reasonably be construed an element of simple carelessness, a verbal reprimand should always precede action that leaves a permanent record
- There is no mention of a "time scale" over which the break of rules occur
- Minor and major offenses should be handled differently

Feedback on Draft Standard for Disciplinary Action

- Tickets for moving violations may be within the error of the speedometer
- More appropriate to require defensive driving after the second or third offense
- Where willful violation or indifference are not a factor, consider associating a time criteria with the number of occurrences

Feedback on Draft Standard for Disciplinary Action

- How about another for depraved indifference to Cyber Security and network procedures
- Passive violations that do not affect others should not be subject to the same punishments as active violations, which endanger co-workers
- Should be a distinction between meeting (i.e., never had training) and maintaining training requirements (course training might have expired by a couple of days)

Feedback on Draft Standard for Disciplinary Action

- Distinction should be made between lost keys and willfully making duplicates
- Like in NYS, there should be a time period for traffic violation, and only a reprimand for first violation
- I would like to think I am not responsible for my designers driving habits. I have talks with them about what the lab expects, but driving on Long Island is a nightmare and I'm sure some of the bad road habits spill over to the lab's roads. I do my best!

Feedback on Draft Standard for Disciplinary Action

- SBMS rules as presently written are much more reasonable in that most discipline guidelines include the word "could", in particular the termination for minor offenses
- SBMS treats traffic violations separately
- C-AD should list the offenses and how they will be treated (significant, major, minor) and then link to the SBMS rules
- Criminal activity (such as assault and theft) should lead to immediate termination as mentioned in the SBMS

Feedback on Draft Standard for Disciplinary Action

- Disciplinary action should only happen after a worker fails to get training after repeated reminders
- Three days of suspension for the failure to report a lost key appears rather harsh
- Traffic violations could result in the suspension of driving privileges on site rather than termination
- Only when driving still occurs while the suspension is active should termination be considered
- Occurrences other than immediate termination should expire after some time, and be deleted from the record

Feedback on Draft Standard for Disciplinary Action

- Suggest adding failure to adhere to or follow job specific safety or security postings, temporary or permanent
- I'm concerned about lumping "sexual harassment" into the last category. I do not see any instance in which a "repeat" incident of sexual harassment would not result in termination. If one reads the guidelines, it would seem that one could get away it four times before facing discharge. In some instances where the behavior is particularly egregious, we've terminated people for a first instance.

Revision 2 of Draft Standard

- Included herein are standards for the administration of disciplinary action for specific types of safety or security offenses at C-AD
- The disciplinary action selected for a particular offense will be chosen based on the facts of the specific situation taking into consideration any extenuating circumstances
- The SBMS Subject Area on Disciplinary Actions and its categories of significant, major and minor offenses will be followed
 - https://sbms.bnl.gov/SBMSearch/subjarea/147/147_Exh1.cfm?ExhibitID=7071

Revision 2 of Draft Standard (4-27-06)

Criminal acts:

- 1) While at work, physical or verbal assault, theft or stealing any material or property with the intent to keep, sell or use it for personal gain will result in immediate termination

Significant offenses:

- 2) *Willful* failure to adhere to or follow RSLOTO, LOTO or Orange Tag Procedures in C-AD OPM Chapters 1, 2, 7 or 9
- 3) *Willful* violation of radiation safety requirements
- 4) Fighting or creating a disturbance that causes injury to others; applies to the aggressor only

Major offenses:

- 5) Failure to adhere to or follow property protection rules in C-AD OPM 1.20
- 6) Failure to report lost or stolen keys for a secured area or equipment; duplicating a key made for a secured area or equipment
- 7) Demonstrating a carelessness or indifference to rules regarding sexual harassment, discrimination and computer security

Minor offenses:

- 8) Failure to wear personal protective equipment while performing work requiring this equipment
- 9) Not meeting or maintaining training requirements listed in your Job Training Assessment

Traffic violations and failure to follow safety or security postings:

- 10) Traffic violations constitute safety infractions and could be cause for disciplinary action. Safety or security postings, whether temporary or permanent, *must* be followed by all managers, supervisors and workers. These violations would be categorized as minor and a graded approach would be used to determine major or significant offenses. In the case of repeat offenders, the length of time between violations would be considered.

Line Accountability for Injuries

- Held accountable but not in a punitive sense
 - Manager responsible for work environment
 - Supervisor responsible for training, awareness and PPE
 - Worker responsible for following rules
- All must step up and share some blame for an injury
 - Consequence: all must work together to prevent in future